

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
OAKLAND DIVISION**

Plaintiff,

LINEAR TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION,

Defendant.

## STIPULATION REGARDING LOCAL PATENT RULES

Plaintiff Gregory Bender (“Bender”) and Defendant Linear Technology Corporation (“LTC”) hereby stipulate and request an Order regarding application of the Local Patent Rules as follows:

1. The parties attended by telephone the Court Management Conference on Tuesday, April 27, 2010, at 2:45 PM.
2. At the CMC, the Court set deadlines for the above-captioned case, including a fact discovery cutoff date and expert disclosure date of September 30, 2010, expert discovery

1 cutoff date of October 29, 2010, a dispositive motion deadline of December 14, 2010, and a  
2 February 8, 2010 pretrial conference date.

3 3. The parties also discussed submitting an agreed order regarding deadlines under  
4 the local patent rules.

5 4. The following proposed schedule generally conforms to the deadlines of the local  
6 patent rules regarding patent-specific disclosures.

7 5. Given that this case is not particularly complex, the following proposed schedule  
8 contemplates that claim construction (*Markman*) disputes will be resolved with other issues by  
9 the dispositive motion deadline.

10 6. Accordingly, the parties propose the following schedule for patent-specific  
11 activities under this Court's Local Patent Rules ("LPR"):

- 12
- 13 • May 17, 2010 - LPR 3.1/3.2 – Plaintiff's disclosure of infringement contentions and  
document production.
- 14 • July 1, 2010 - LPR 3.3/3.4 - Defendant's invalidity contentions and document  
15 production
- 16 • July 12, 2010 - LPR 4.1 - Parties identify terms for construction
- 17 • August 2, 2010 - LPR 4.2(a)/4.2(b) - Parties exchange preliminary claim constructions  
and claim construction evidence
- 18 • September 1, 2010 - LPR 4.3 – Parties file Joint Claim Construction statement; Parties  
19 Disclose claim construction evidence and witnesses; Parties identify 10 most significant  
claim terms
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25
- 26
- 27
- 28

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 11, 2010

By /s/ David N. Kuhn

David N. Kuhn (CSB #73389)  
Attorney-at-Law  
[dnkuhn@packbell.net](mailto:dnkuhn@packbell.net)  
144 Hagar Avenue  
Piedmont, CA 94611  
Tel.: (510) 653-4983

Attorney for PLAINTIFF  
GREGORY BENDER

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 11, 2010

By /s/ Mark D. Rowland

Mark D. Rowland (CSB #157862)  
[mark.rowland@ropesgray.com](mailto:mark.rowland@ropesgray.com)  
Joshua V. Van Hoven (CSB #262815)  
[joshua.vanhoven@ropesgray.com](mailto:joshua.vanhoven@ropesgray.com)  
ROPES & GRAY LLP  
1900 University Avenue  
East Palo Alto, California 94303  
Tel.: (650) 617-4000  
Fax: (650) 617-4090

Attorneys for DEFENDANT  
LINEAR TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION

Filer's Attestation: Pursuant to General Order No. 45, Section X(B) regarding  
signatures, I attest under penalty of perjury that concurrence in filing of the document has been  
obtained from David N. Kuhn, Esq.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 11, 2010

By /s/ Mark D. Rowland

Mark D. Rowland (CSB #157862)

[mark.rowland@ropesgray.com](mailto:mark.rowland@ropesgray.com)

Joshua V. Van Hoven (CSB #262815)

[joshua.vanhoven@ropesgray.com](mailto:joshua.vanhoven@ropesgray.com)

ROPES & GRAY LLP

1900 University Avenue

East Palo Alto, California 94303

Tel.: (650) 617-4000

Fax: (650) 617-4090

Attorneys for DEFENDANT

LINEAR TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION

PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: 5/14/10



Hon. Sandra B. Armstrong  
United States District Court  
Northern District of California